

REMARKS:Status

After entry of this amendment, claims 1 to 14 and 16 to 34 will be pending, with claims 17 to 20 withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1 and 21 are the independent claims. Claims 8 and 22 have been amended herein.

Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 7-16,21, and 26-34 are rejected as unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Diwan (US6,801,936) in view of Sahai et al (US6,594,699). Claims 4-6, and 23-25, are rejected as unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Diwan (US6,801,936) in view of Sahai et al (US6,594,699), further in view of Fienleib (US6,272,532). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1 and Dependent Claims: Claim 1 has not been amended. The claim recites the following:

1. A method for customizing a structured markup language document and delivering said customized structured markup language document to an internet appliance, comprising:
 - identifying information units in an original structured markup language document;
 - selecting one or more of said information units for delivery;
 - creating in a database a second structured markup language document including said one or more of said information units, said second structured markup language document customized according to capabilities of and for delivery to said internet appliance;
 - delivering to said internet appliance a menu for selection of at least said second structured markup language document, said menu including as a

selection item at least a bookmark representing said second structured markup language document; and
delivering said second structured markup language document to said internet appliance.

The applied art, alone or in combination, does not disclose or suggest the foregoing features of claim 1, at least with respect to “said menu including as a selection item at least a bookmark representing said second structured markup language document.”

With respect to this feature, the Office Action stated the following: “Delivering to said internet appliance a menu for selection of at least said second structured markup language document, said menu including as a selection item at least a bookmark representing said second structured markup language document (column 1, lines 60-63, column 2, [lines] 45-48, column 6, lines 17-20).” Furthermore, in response to an argument similar to this one, the Office Action’s “Response to Arguments” section stated the following: “(d) Diwan teaches presenting the user with an ID address of the customized information (document) (column 5, lines 50-59).” The text found at each of these citations is discussed below.

Col. 1, lines 58-63, states the following: “The system gathers information from multiple information sources, packages at least some of the gathered information into customized bundles according to the received requests and the stored rules, and delivers the customized bundles to the subscribers according to the stored rules.” This text makes no mention whatsoever of anything that could be fairly interpreted as equivalent to claim 1’s bookmark representing a second structured markup language document.

Col. 2, lines 43-48, states the following: “The systems and methods gather information from the sources, package them into customized bundles according to requests and rules defined by the subscribers and/or agent managers, and transmit the bundles to the subscribers based on the rules using Internet protocol (IP) multicast routing techniques.” This text also makes no mention whatsoever of anything that could be fairly interpreted as equivalent to claim 1’s bookmark representing a second structured markup language document.

Col. 6, lines 17-20, states the following: “Once the bundles of information have been generated, the agent 190 distributes them to the subscribers [step 540]. The agent 190 may use IP multicast techniques to distribute a bundle to all of the subscribers requesting the information.” Once again, this text also makes no mention whatsoever of anything that could be fairly interpreted as equivalent to claim 1’s bookmark representing a second structured markup language document.

Even if the customized bundle in each of the three sections of text discussed above is interpreted to be equivalent to the claimed second structured markup language document (a point which Applicants do not concede), no mention whatsoever is made of a bookmark representing that customized bundle.

Turning to Col. 5, lines 49-59, that text states the following: “If the subscriber requests information that the agent 190 does not already obtain for another subscriber, the agent 190 may identify the information provider that broadcasts the information and arrange to receive the broadcast stream [step 450]. Alternatively, the agent 190 may request delivery of the information from an information provider [step 450]. In this case, the agent 190 may obtain a multicast group

identification (ID) address from the information provider for use by the agent 190 in receiving the information provided by the information provider. The agent 190 then begins listening for information from information providers using one or more multicast group ID addresses.” This language does discuss an identification (ID) for information. However, the ID is a “multicast group identification (ID)” that is obtained **“from the information provider”** and is used **“by the agent 190 in receiving the information provided by the information provider.”** Thus, the ID is *not* a bookmark representing a second structured markup language document or customized bundle.

Nothing else in Diwan discloses or fairly suggests the claimed “bookmark representing said second structured markup language document.” Thus, Diwan does not disclose or suggest this feature, let alone a “menu including as a selection item at least” such a bookmark as recited by claim 1.

Neither Sahai nor Fienleib remedies the foregoing deficiencies of Diwan.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested of the rejections of claim 1 and its dependent claims. Allowance of these claims also is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 and Dependent Claims: Claim 21 has not been amended. The claim recites the following:

21. A document customization system, comprising:
 - a management server offering a document customization service to a user;
 - a document manager associated with said management server for performing said document customization service to web pages identified by said user, said document customization service customizing said web pages according to capabilities of and for delivery to an internet appliance, said

document customization service identifying information units in said web pages and enabling the user to select one or more of said information units for delivery to the user;

a database accessible by said document manager, said database storing customized web pages resulting from said document manager performing said document customization service; and

a portal for accessing said customized web pages in said database via bookmarks representing at least said customized web pages.

The applied art, alone or in combination, does not disclose or suggest the foregoing features of claim 21, at least with respect to “a portal for accessing said customized web pages in said database via bookmarks representing at least said customized web pages.” Substantially as discussed above with respect to claim 1, the applied art does not disclose or suggest such bookmarks, let alone the recited portal.

New Feature in Amended Claims: Claims 8 and 22 have been amended to recite that the at least one of the claimed bookmarks is associated with an internet appliance. Thus, for example, a user using a particular internet appliance could select that bookmark to receive delivery of a web page customized for that internet appliance. The applied art discussed above clearly does not disclose or suggest this feature. Accordingly, amended claims 8 and 22 are allowable over and above their base claims for this additional reason.

Arguments in Previous Response

Applicants acknowledge that the Examiner has not found the other arguments presented in the previous response to be persuasive. However, Applicants wish to make clear that Applicants believe those arguments are valid and therefore wish to preserve those arguments in the

record, for example in terms of the prosecution history of this case as it might be applied to any future litigation involving the application and any patent(s) that may issue thereon.

No Admission

Applicant's decision not to argue each of the dependent claims separately is not an admission that the subject matter of those claims is disclosed or suggested by the applied art.

Closing

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney can be reached at (614) 205-3241. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the address indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dane C. Butzer/

Dane C. Butzer

Reg. No. 43,521

Dated: May 22, 2008

Swernofsky Law Group PC
P.O. Box 390013
Mountain View, CA 94039-0013
(650) 947-0700